



Hadrian's Heir

Author(s): Edward Champlin

Source: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 21 (1976), pp. 79-89

Published by: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn (Germany)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20181085>

Accessed: 23/03/2010 17:59

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=habelt>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn (Germany) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

HADRIAN'S HEIR

There has been of late considerable discussion of Hadrian's attempts to secure the succession to his throne.¹⁾ The present note is an adjunct to that discussion, dealing neither with Antoninus Pius, the ultimate heir, nor with the unfortunate Aelius Caesar, whose son eventually realized his claim, but with the forgotten man, Pedanius Fuscus. A mere collection of the slight evidence for Fuscus' existence will prove beneficial, for what little there is has been neglected or ill appreciated. However, more important, the consideration of an historical "might-have-been" will yield a valuable clue to what actually did occur in the year 138.

This Pedanius Fuscus leaves little mark in the literary records of Hadrian's reign, be it as inept conspirator, foolish dupe or innocent victim. Prejudice all but obscures the matter of his fall whether it derives from an 'official', Hadrian-inspired version or from the senatorial reaction. Dio's account (in epitome) is brief, consistent and hostile to the emperor: the beginning and the end of Hadrian's reign, he asserts, were stained by the blood of the leading men of the state. In the early months the emperor's agents slew the Four Consulars, and at the end Servianus – that is, his sister's husband L. Iulius Ursus Servianus, *cos III* in 134 – and the old man's grandson, Fuscus (69.2.6). This remark, found in an early part of the account, is developed in the proper place. Thus, Hadrian fell seriously ill and in 136 named and adopted as Aelius Caesar the ordinary consul of that year, L. Ceionius Commodus. Servianus and his grandson Fuscus were slain because of their resentment at the adoption, Servianus in his nineties, Fuscus aged eighteen (69.17.1). Two anecdotes are added: in the first Servianus swears solemnly to his innocence and calls down upon Hadrian a lingering death; in the second it is suggested that the emperor had considered his brother-in-law to be *capax imperii* in palmier days (17.2-3). The

1) J. Carcopino, REA 51 (1949) 262-321 = (in expanded form) *Passion et politique chez les Césars* (Paris, 1958) 143-222; P. Grenade, REA 52 (1950) 258-77; E. Hohl, SBAW 1953.2, 31-54; H.-G. Pflaum, *Bonner Hist. Aug. Colloquium* 1963.95-122; T.D. Barnes, JRS 57 (1967) 74-79; J. Carcopino, REA 67 (1965) 67-79; R. Syme, *Historia* 17 (1968) 84-98; N. Hannestad, *Anal. Rom.* 7 (1974) 67-100 (on the iconography of Aelius Caesar).

An earlier version of this paper profited greatly by the comments of Professor T.D. Barnes and Sir Ronald Syme.

epitome of Dio is skeletal but leaves no doubt that the historian shared what was apparently the prejudice of his class, for Servianus' curse (and his innocence) entered into senate lore. When a blameless descendent of Aelius Caesar was slain under the reign of Septimius Severus he simply remarked, "I make the same prayer that Servianus made for Hadrian."²⁾

By contrast the *Historia Augusta* is repetitious and confused. Four passages refer to the same event:

1. (In a register of friends against whom Hadrian later turned) *Servianum sororis virum nonagesimum iam annum agentem, ne sibi superviveret, mori coegit.* (HA Hadr. 15.8)
2. (Hadrian's illness confines him to bed) *Factusque de successore sollicitus primum de Serviano cogitavit, quem postea, ut diximus, mori coegit, <item>³⁾ Fuscum, quod imperium praesagiis et ostentis agitatus speraret.* (23.2-3)
3. (Hadrian suffers a serious attack) *Tunc libere Servianum quasi adfectatorem imperii, quod servis regis cenam misisset, quod in sedili regio iuxta lectum posito sedisset, quod erectus ad stationes militum senex nonagenarius processisset, mori coegit, multis aliis interfectis vel aperte vel per insidias.* (23.8)
4. (Hadrian adopts Commodus and, in turn, Antoninus) *Sub ipso mortis tempore et Servianum nonaginta annos agentem, ut supra dictum est, ne sibi superviveret atque, ut putabat, imperaret, mori coegit et ob leves offensas plurimos iussit occidi quos Antoninus reservavit.* (25.8)

The chronological confusion is complete, but hardly surprising when we consider the confusion of the context. Passages 1, 3 and 4 are clearly derived from a single account which reported that Hadrian in his illness feared that the nonagenarian Servianus wished to rule after his death, that Servianus was alleged to have betrayed this desire by various actions, and that he had several supporters. The less hostile passage 2 stands apart, not least in its lack of repetition, beyond the ubiquitous "mori coegit" (and the clause "quem.... coegit" looks like a clumsy insertion). It introduces two assertions absent elsewhere in the biography but noted by Cassius Dio, that is that Hadrian himself considered Servianus as a possible successor, and that a certain Fuscus (otherwise unidentified) was involved in his ruin. It is also the unique source for a third item, that Fuscus was spurred on by signs and portents to hope for the empire. The HA is surely operating in this matter from two

²⁾ Dio 76.7.3-4. The senate's hatred of Hadrian is well attested in the period immediately after his death: HA Hadr. 27.2, Pius 5.1; Dio 69.23.3, 70.1.2-3.

³⁾ Thus H. Peter's edition. E. Hohl subsequently read simply: "... mori coegit. Fuscum, quod imperium praesagiis et ostentis agitatus speraret, in summa detestatione habuit." But, (1) Fuscus and Servianus are a pair, slain together, and (2) the detestation is better applied to Platorius Nepos who follows in the text and who survived.

sources which are temptingly identifiable with the scandalous *Marius Maximus*, a senator (1,3,4) and with Sir Ronald Syme's more sober *Ignotus*. (2)⁴ Further, passage 2 might reflect the apologetic narrative evident elsewhere - Hadrian's memoirs or derived therefrom? - which portrayed *Servianus* as an envious ingrate. Thus, we are told by the biographer, when Hadrian had been hurrying to inform Trajan of the death of *Nerva*, *Servianus* (*sororis vir*) had purposely detained him and then tampered with his carriage. (Nevertheless the ambitious messenger won through.) And previously *Servianus* had stirred up trouble between the kinsmen by betraying his extravagance and his debts to Trajan (2.6). However Hadrian the emperor treated the inveterate intriguer with magnanimity:

Serviano sororis viro, cui tantum detulit ut ei venienti de cubiculo semper occurreret, tertium consulatum, nec secum tamen, cum ille bis ante Hadrianum fuisset, ne esset secundae sententiae, non petenti ac sine precatione concessit.
(8.11)

If we allow for two sources divergent in attitude, and if we ignore the wild chronological confusion in favour of Dio's straightforward and plausible account (which the HA never quite contradicts), the fragments of the biography can be brought into line with each other and with Dio. The sequence of events is easily reconstructed. Hadrian's serious illness in 136 brought the question of succession to the fore: the first choice would be *Servianus*, as the biographer informs us. This need be no more than an educated guess, but two factors must have stood out. First, the aged senator was by far the most distinguished man in the state, thrice consul and the adopted son of a consul *ter*,⁵ and the emperor's brother-in-law, hence at the least the obvious figurehead. And Hadrian himself had dubbed him *capax imperii*. Second, there was a dynastic consideration, for Aelian blood flowed in the veins of *Servianus*' grandson. The portents revealed to *Fuscus* merely confirmed the obvious ultimate successor. However the emperor changed his mind and adopted *Ceionius Commodus* to the dismay of his own kinsmen. The subsequent charges against them were probably only too well founded in fact, for what were formerly perfectly acceptable actions could be construed as treason in the new light. Grandfather and grandson were "compelled to die" (whatever that might mean) and unnamed associates were involved in their fall. Thus far a consistent narrative can be elicited from the historians, but many

4) See especially R.Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1971), 113-117.

5) L. Iulius Ursus, cos. III 100 A.D.: *Fasti Ostienses ined.* (confirming CIL VI.1432), reported by F.Zevi, *Akt. VI Epigr. Kongress* (München, 1973), 438.

important facts are missing and several questions remain unanswered, not least: "Why Commodus?". The meagreness of the record is hardly due to chance, for it was in the interest of neither Hadrian nor his successors to perpetuate the memory.

Most fortunately, however, three neglected documents may combine to produce a valuable supplement to the record of these events.

First, a Greek horoscope survives in a Byzantine epitome of the *Apotelesmatica* of Hephaestio of Thebes which must surely be that of the youth with imperial dreams. The identification was made by its editor, F. Cumont, and recently noted by R. Syme and G. W. Bowersock without comment, but only F. H. Cramer has attempted to exploit it.⁶⁾ However it is of prime importance as evidence. For a horoscope to be acceptable (especially for use in a subsequent compilation) it should be correct, all the more so in the case of a prominent figure where the facts might be easily verifiable. The authenticity of the piece is irrelevant; its facts must be credible. This particular example occurs in most suggestive company, in a group of three extracted together from the collection of Antigonus of Nicaea. The first is undoubtedly that of Hadrian, the second concerns an unknown born 5 April, 40, in the correct latitude for southern Spain, perhaps Hadrian's father or (far less likely) Servianus himself, or (as Professor Barnes will argue) Licinius Sura. Stripped of astrological detail that attributed to Pedanius Fuscus supplies the following information:

He (Antigonus), records a third nativity and says of this person that he was born to the ruin of himself and his antecedents about his twenty-fifth year. . . . He came of a powerful and illustrious family, that is both through his father and his mother, who lived with great honour and died violently. He was born with great expectations and looked forward to acceding to the monarchy. Through ill-counselling he came to grief about his twenty-fifth year, and being denounced to the emperor he was destroyed with an old man of his family (who was falsely accused through him); moreover everyone of his family died miserably because of him. . . . He was given to passion and fond of gladiators. . . .⁷⁾

From the data supplied the subject's birthday has been calculated as 6 April, 113.⁸⁾ His twenty-fifth year thus fell in 137/138. This could be no one but the ill-starred Pedanius

6) F. Cumont, *Cat. cod. astr. graec.* VIII.2.85; R. Syme, *Historia* 17 (1968) 96 n.112; G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (1969), 118-19; F. H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman law and politics* (1954), 174-78, 267-69.

7) Hephaestio, *Epit.* IV.26.52, 55, 56 (231-232 Pingree).

8) O. Neugebauer and H. B. van Heusen, *Greek horoscopes* (1959), 108-109; an English abstract of the horoscope is provided.

Fuscus.

Several observations may be made. First, the one contradictory detail cannot stand against the accumulated coincidences with the narrative historians: Dio's age for the youth (eighteen) must be abandoned in the face of the horoscope's repeated "about his twenty-fifth year", one item which it must know. The splendour of his ancestry, which might have been surmised, happens to stand explicitly attested in one of Pliny's most polite epistles (VI.26), written to congratulate Iulius Servianus on the engagement of his daughter to a certain Fuscus Salinator of patrician lineage and a special favourite of Pliny himself. From this union of great families was born a son whose prospects were bright even at the moment of his birth in 113. If Trajan's thoughts turned to a dynastic succession they would not stop with the childless Hadrian, but rather with the next kinsman, the infant Pedanius Fuscus. And when Hadrian acceded he gave clear sign of favour to the child's ancestors both paternal and maternal: Fuscus' father was surely the Cn. Pedanius Fuscus Salinator consul with the emperor himself in the first ordinary consulship of the new reign (118) and perhaps soon thereafter assigned to the Moesian command; while his mother's father was eventually raised to the rare honour of a third consulship and pointed out at some time as a possible emperor. At this point the horoscope dramatically reverses the tale related by Dio and the HA: Fuscus it was who dragged down his grandfather and all of his family, not the contrary. The historians have been misled by the prominence of the aged Servianus, whose innocence the horoscope appears to confirm. Common sense would tend to its support. Hadrian remarked, perhaps sarcastically, that Servianus was capable of ruling after him. The idea of a nonagenarian emperor may be ludicrous, but a senior senator, a respected caretaker smoothing the transition of power from an emperor unpopular with the senate to his selected heir is a sound manoeuvre. In fact Hadrian did implement such a plan in the event, employing different actors.

Thus the focus must shift to Fuscus. The horoscope supplies further detail. The youth was betrayed by bad counsel, that is a plot is suggested. And a pretext (at least) must have been found for an accusation. The HA speaks of his excitement at "praesagia et ostenta", and the existence of a *genitura* might be surmised from the words of the horoscope. The obvious charge, as Cramer observed, would be *maiestas*. More important, the impression is given of a rather weak-minded young man swayed by evil friends and dazzled by astrologers. And what little character the horoscope implies is an appropriate one, that of a man

amorous and fond of gladiators, perhaps the sort who might easily be led astray.

One ambiguity (out of many) in the horoscope demands attention. Fuscus, we are told, was born into great prospects and was confident of succeeding to the empire. It would seem patent that reference should be made to the "praesagia and the ostenta" of the HA. But is that an obvious assumption from the text of the horoscope alone? If astrological significance be given to these remarks, a nativity cast in 113 must be assumed, a nativity which proved to be false. Antigonus' horoscope might well pass over it in silence, but could it advert to it without commenting on its gross error (as must be assumed)? The argument *e silentio* is admittedly fragile, but it will justify exploration of the alternative, that is that Fuscus' confidence derived not from the stars but from the favour of Hadrian, and indeed more mundane *ostenta* can be discovered.

Thanks to the care of Professor Bowersock a neglected source can be made to yield a most useful item. In the Arabic version of the emperor Hadrian's encounter with the silent philosopher Secundus we are offered the opinion of one present, "Salan, the king's cousin, who was very modest and of pious aspect."⁹⁾ Bowersock has rightly called attention to this man, recognizing in him the consul of 118, Pedanius Fuscus Salinator.¹⁰⁾ As he suggests, the slight muddle in the relationship can be ignored. However, could this not equally be that man's son (who would certainly better qualify for the title "cousin")? The interview with Hadrian was held at Athens on one of his several visits to the city, the last two of which fell in 128/129 and 131/132.¹¹⁾ In the latter year Fuscus would be nineteen years of age. Perhaps he was brought up, as the HA alleges of Marcus Aurelius, "in Hadriani gremio", and like the precocious Marcus was allowed to shine on public occasions.¹²⁾ At any rate it is most welcome to discover a cousin of the emperor as a member of his entourage, and perhaps of his *consilium*, during the famous peregrinations.

With that in mind consideration should be directed towards the recently published inscription from a mutilated statue base turned up by the excavations at Ephesus (JÖAI 49 (1968/71) Beiblatt 31-34, with photographs = AE 1972.578). The text is bilingual, Greek

9) B.E. Perry, *Secundus the silent philosopher* (1964), 127.

10) Bowersock, *Greek Sophists* 118-119.

11) See the Greek text at Perry, 72.9ff. Secundus taught and died at Athens: Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* I 26 p.544-45, with Bowersock's remarks. Hadrian at Athens: W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (1907), 205-10, 268-75.

12) HA Marcus 4.1, 6.

followed by Latin, offering versions identical in all but one respect: the long name of the honorand is succeeded by his brief *cursus honorum* and by the name and office of the donor. By combining the versions of his name, both much mutilated, it stands at its fullest as

[.] Velleius P.? f. Tro.[...] L. Sertorius [... Ped]anius Fuscus Sa[linat]or
Sallus[ti]us Bla[esus .] Iulius Agricola [...] Caesonius.¹³⁾

Inevitably this person hereinafter "Lucius") calls to mind an equally polyonymous and troublesome nobleman ("Gnaeus") commemorated with no other information on a stone from Doclea in Dalmatia:

Cn. Serto[rius] C. f. Brocc[hus] Aquilius [...] Agricola [.] Ped[an]ius F[uscus]
Salinat[or] Iulius Servianus (CIL III.13826).

Together the two men raise more problems than this note can pretend to solve.

High birth is immediately apparent for Lucius, as some three or four Flavian consulars are represented in his name. The greatest surprise, and completely unexpected (although foreshadowed by Gnaeus), is the item "Iulius Agricola". Tacitus betrays no hint of any connection in his eulogy of his father-in-law, but the biographer was not above artistic omission of inessential detail.¹⁴⁾ The nature of the link is beyond conjecture.

Next, P. Sallustius Blaesus (cos. 89) is surely represented here by "Sallustius Bla..." This man is registered in the *Acta fratrum Arvalium* for several years between 78 and 91 - from 89 as *magister* - but is absent in 101 and subsequently.¹⁵⁾ It is a fair presumption that he died in the interval 91/101. An arresting conjecture about this man was published in 1958 by Professor Syme: he might be polyonymous, the same as Sallustius Lucullus the legate of Britain destroyed by Domitian (Suetonius, Dom. 10.3), "with (e.g.) 'Velleius' for his second gentilicium, cf. 'Velleius Blaesus ille locuples consularis' (Pliny, Epp. II.20.7)."¹⁶⁾ Pliny's anecdote exposes the operations of Aquilius Regulus at the deathbed of Velleius Blaesus, at first exhorting the doctors to keep him alive, but when the dying man had effected certain changes in his will reproaching them for prolonging his

13) The reader interested in line lengths is urged to consult the photographs accompanying the original publication. They appear to have no effect on the problems here considered.

14) Thus he makes no mention of the quaestor M. Iulius L. f. Ani. Graecinus who raised a sepulchral inscription to Agricola's father, L. Iulius Graecinus: AE 1946.94.

15) CIL VI p.588 for the references; for 101 etc. pp.528ff.

16) Tacitus (1958), 648.

agony: all to no purpose, for nothing was left to the would-be captator. The dramatic date is obviously Domitianic. Now both Statius and Martial refer to a recently deceased Blaesus, the friend of their wealthy patron Atedius Melior. Statius makes it clear that the man is of noble birth and probably a senator, while the book-date of Martial's notice would put the death around 93 A.D.¹⁷⁾ The man could well be Pliny's Velleius Blaesus. Similarly, the death of Sallustius Lucullus would fit the time of the Domitianic 'terror'. Suetonius mentions the alleged cause of his downfall: he allowed a new kind of spear to be named after him. Identity of the two is not excluded by the sources, for Suetonius' hostile notice need not imply execution, while Pliny's remarks do not exclude suicide or premature decease. The new inscription brings unexpected support to Syme's *obiter dictum* with its first item, ". Velleius P. ? f.", and a new figure can emerge, the composite of three shadowy consulars who died in the latter years of the reign of Domitian, viz. P. Velleius P.f. Tro. Lucullus Sallustius Blaesus, cos. suff. 89.¹⁸⁾ The exact date and circumstances of his demise c.93 remain unclear, although there is a notable echo of the contemporary death of another ex-governor of Britain, and the conjunction of their names on the Ephesian stone may arouse speculation. And it is possible that the connection with Regulus was significantly distorted by Pliny, neither so casual nor so venal as he describes, for the third line of the Doclea inscription bears the word "Aquilio ...". In an age rife with senatorial Aquilii might we nevertheless restore "[Regulo]"?¹⁹⁾

We can now restore with more or less temerity the full name on the Ephesian stone as

[P.] Velleius P.f. Tro.[Lucullus?]L. Sertorius [Brocchus Ped]anius Fuscus
Salinator Sallustius Blaesus [Cn.] Iulius Agricola ... Caesonius.

It will be noticed that on the reconstruction proposed above the name of Velleius Blaesus is split by two other items, whence it may reasonably be assumed that the Sertorius/Pedanius element cohered before the assumption of Velleius/Sallustius, and the names of Gnaeus will confirm. The *origo* of the Pedanii was Barcino, in Tarraconensis, while the name Sertorius inevitably suggests Spain as well, and both families first appear in the

17) Statius, *Silvae* II.1. 189-207, cf. II.3. 77. 191: "generosique... Blaesi"; 195: "Ausonios inter proceres seriemque Quirini". Martial VIII.38.

18) For the structure of the name see the valuable remarks of A.R. Birley, *Britannia* 4 (1973) 181, with n.12.

19) For later Aquilii Reguli see ILS 1075 and Diog. XXXIX.5.27.

senate under Claudius. The connection then may have been an ancient one. Now in the year 120 the legate of Moesia Inferior is known to have been a certain [A]rtorius or [Se]rtorius.²⁰⁾ In favour of the latter name stands the near relationship by marriage of the Pedanii with the (Spanish) emperor Hadrian, and the honour reflected in the consulship of 118. [Se]rtorius will surely be a member of the same group: it will be recalled that his successor in Moesia has been conjectured (surely with reason) to have been another intimate of both Hadrian and Pedanius, C. Ummidius Quadratus (suff. 118).²¹⁾ One might go further. If the connection between Sertorii and Pedanii was indeed an old one the mysterious legate might be none other than Quadratus' old *contubernalis* Pedanius Fuscus himself (ord. 118), whose relationship to the new princeps would enable him to outstrip his friend.²²⁾ Such a man stood very close to the throne.

Returning to the new stone from Ephesus we may next consider Lucius' brief *cursus honorum*. He had been *Illvir a.a.a.f.f.* but was not yet quaestor, therefore was presumably in his late teens or early twenties: of the four offices of the *vigintivirate* this one attracts the highest proportion of patrician youths. Similarly the pontificate (curiously absent in the Greek version), which went at an early age only to the highest aristocracy.²³⁾ These serve merely to confirm the promise latent in his splendid polyonymy. Unfortunately one item is absent, the occasion for the statue. The answer may seem obvious, that he was legate of a proconsul who might well be his father or a close relative, and an apt occasion is available. A Cn. Pedanius Fuscus Salinator (suffect consul in the early years of Domitian) is attested as proconsul of Asia at some time towards the year 100.²⁴⁾ His son, the future consul of 118, could with little difficulty be seen as his legate if we assume a slight delay in his career before a swift advancement to the consulship by his uncle. That he was not yet a senator need cause no trouble, for several near-contemporaries of the late first and early second centuries are known to have been proconsular legates before their quaestor-

20) CIL III.12493, Tomi.

21) R. Syme, *Historia* 17 (1968) 88-90.

22) The two were Pliny's favourites, rivalling each other: *Epp.* VI.11.

23) Cf. M.W. Hoffman Lewis, *The official priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians* (1955), 24-26.

24) Cf. W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (1970), 155 n.179.

ships.²⁵⁾ However other factors must be considered. First, the praenomen Lucius: the consul of 118 was Gnaeus. This is hardly prohibitive, for the Ephesian stone is mutilated and may have included "[Cn. Ped]anius". However the Gnaeus of the Doclean stone exhibits no other praenomen, and just as he was probably known as Cn. Pedanius Fuscus so the man at Ephesus would simply be L. Pedanius Fuscus. Second, the man is not called legate. This is very odd, for if he were in Asia on his father's staff he would surely have received that title just as other pre-quaestorians did and displayed it in his *cursus* as they did. And, equally strange, there is no indication that he is being honoured as a member of the proconsul's family. If he is neither legate nor relative there need be no connection with the proconsul at all. Third, and most surprising, the youth is attended by a lictor, for the dedicator "Flavius Bassus, lictor", must be *lictor eius* or the dedication loses all point. As the editor (D. Knibbe) suggests, either he must be engaged on a special mission (of which there is no sign), or he is simply a very important person.²⁶⁾ Thus the consul of 118 seems a non-starter.²⁷⁾

The only other possible candidate of whom we know is his son, Hadrian's great-nephew. The Ephesian stone is anomalous on any view, a bilingual inscription on the base of a statue erected in a prominent public place in the provincial capital, dedicated to a very young man of the highest rank but not yet a senator, a man who was neither on the staff of the proconsul nor a member of his family, and one who was already a pontifex and apparently attended by a lictor. The emperor Hadrian's last attested visit to Ephesus was paid in 129, having arrived by sea from Athens.²⁸⁾ (And he could have stopped there in 132 en route from Syria to Pontus.) The travelling prince may well have been accompanied by another young man, likewise a Pedanius Fuscus, who seems to have enjoyed every prospect of succeeding to the empire. On every count he coalesces very neatly with the young man at Ephesus. One might even conjecture that the occasion was a meeting between uncle and

25) E.G., ILS 1038, 1072, CIL VI.1440.

26) A precedent (if one be required) for lictors attending private members of the imperial family could be found in Agrippina: Tacitus, Ann. 13.2.6.

27) I am inclined to identify him with the Gnaeus of the inscription from Doclea (commemorating an exile?), but the argument is inconclusive. At any rate Groag's suggestion (PW Pedanius 5) that Gnaeus of Doclea was the great-grandson of Servianus and the ill-fated prince of 136/137 (taking Dio loosely) is vitiated by the marriage of the consul of 118 and Servianus' daughter not antedating c.107 (the date of Pliny's letter).

28) Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (1907) 205-210, 268-275.

nephew during the emperor's final return to Rome from the Jewish War: the year 134 marked the apogee of the family's position with the third consulship of Iulius Servianus.

The evidence converges to suggest that the younger Pedanius Fuscus was groomed for the imperial succession from an early age, at least from the beginning of his great-uncle's reign. His father was probably a pillar of the new regime and his grandfather was accorded marks of exceptional respect. He himself was granted special privileges at an early age and perhaps a place in the emperor's counsels. However, he was merely heir presumptive, not apparent (if one may apply terms from an alien system); no commitment was made. Then, in the latter half of 136, Hadrian startled the world with his adoption of Ceionius Commodus, "invitis omnibus".²⁹⁾ There need have been no dramatic rupture with Fuscus, but merely a growing conviction on the emperor's part that his kinsman and favoured heir was proving to be inadequate. The youth reacted in predictable fashion to his sudden change in circumstances, perhaps even providing a pretext for denunciation. On any view the situation was intolerable for his former patron and dangerous for the new Caesar: Pedanius Fuscus and his family and supporters must be removed. Thus far the events of 136 or 137 can be explained or explained away, but the brief career of L. Pedanius Fuscus Salinator also neatly illustrates a *de facto* principle of the empire, the effectively hereditary nature of the principate.³⁰⁾ Hadrian's final dynastic arrangements have undergone exhaustive scrutiny in recent years. The salient fact is that Antoninus Pius was to be a caretaker emperor (he was only a decade younger than Hadrian) for the son of Aelius Caesar, for the ultimate successor was clearly intended to be the boy L. Ceionius Commodus (Lucius Verus).³¹⁾ Now it appears, if the preceding arguments are accepted, that from an early date Hadrian had aimed to secure a dynastic succession through a prince of the blood reared for that purpose. The emperor was duly cautious, the experiment proved unsatisfactory, but a lesson was learned and in the end a new prince and a new caretaker were successfully substituted. At beginning and end the emperor's thoughts were on a dynasty. In the interlude comes the startling and inexplicable selection of Ceionius Commodus. It might be necessary to deduce that Aelius Caesar was a close connection, perhaps even, as Carcopino outrageously suggested on a misreading of the evidence a generation ago, Hadrian's bastard son.

Princeton

Edward Champlin

29) HA Hadr. 23.11.

30) Cf. J. Béranger, "L'hérédité du principat", REA 17 (1939) 171-87.

31) T.D. Barnes, JRS (1967) 74-79.